

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on November 4, 2008.

Claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, and 16 are amended; claims 3-5, 7, 9, 11, and 22-30 were previously canceled, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10, and 12-21 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification page 5 line 29 through page 6 line 5; page 8 line 28 to page 9 line 2; page 9 line 27 through page 10 line 2; page 10 lines 9-14 and 24-26; page 12 lines 20-25; page 14 lines 3-5; page 15 lines 24-27; and page 16 lines 11-13.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 13 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al. (U.S. 6,081,900). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection, each and every element must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

Initially, Applicant would like to point out to the Examiner that in Subramaniam the purported "access attempts" are contained wholly within the secure network 100 (*see* FIG. 1 and entire discussion in Subramaniam, such as column 6 lines 42-44; column 9 lines 41-43; column 10 lines 36-40; *etc.*).

It appears from the discussion provided by the Examiner that the initial connection between a client and the border server or transformer server is being viewed as what Applicant has claimed as "access attempts." But, the independent claims have established two distinct elements, the first being a "secure session" and the second being "access attempts" during that secure session. Clearly, the initial authentication and session establishment of Subramaniam are not also access attempts to "insecure transactions" where those "insecure transactions" are "identified as links to a site that is external to and not controlled by the secure site."

Applicant has clarified what is meant by insecure transaction in a manner that is consistent with the original filed specification. It is a site that is not recognized to the secure site.

Clearly, the IP address of the requestor is known and is actively evaluated in the Subramaniam reference to setup authentication. Thus, for at least this reason the rejection with respect to Subramaniam should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Additionally, Applicant has added an element where a number of the links are directed to insecure references that are identified by looking at a pre-defined list that identifies references not recognized by the secure site. Moreover, these true insecure references are entirely removed from the content before being delivered to the external client.

Applicant notes that what Subramaniam has done is to ensure that all communication between a client and a secure site are made secure. Applicant has taken this a step further and enhanced it to also pre-acquire content from external sites not controlled or contained within the secure site and scanning that content to remove harmful references. Subramaniam has obvious benefits and improvements but it is not concerned with pre-acquiring external content from the secure site and inspecting it to remove truly harmful references (associated with external sites to the secure site) before that is delivered to the external client.

Claims 10, 12, 14, 15 and 18-21 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam et al. in view of "Netscape Proxy Server Administrator's Guide Version 3.5 for Unix", 1997, hereinafter Netscape_unix_v3.5. These claims are dependent from amended independent claims; as such, claims 10, 12, 14-15, and 18-21 are allowable in view of the amendments and remarks presented above with respect to the corresponding independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action, however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record is relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

CONCLUSION


Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date 02-03-09

By /  /
Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535